

PATENTS  
112025-0483  
CPOL # 124051 Seq.# 4446

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated 11/16/2005 rejecting all the claims 1-83 existing in the application.

This amendment amends all the independent claims 1, 9, 19, 27, 35, 43, 51, 59, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74. Independent claims 14, 75-80, were not amended.

Claims 81 and 83 were amended to correct their dependencies that the Examiner objected to on Page 2 of the Office Action.

As a preliminary comment, as the application now stands all the independent claims share the same limitation with word changes consistent with the specific claim language (e.g. apparatus, method, media, E+M signals, etc.).

The changes to claim one exemplify the new limitation introduced by the claims, claim 1 reads in part as follows, with differences highlighted in bold and italics:

*a receiver arranged to receive a first request from a first sourcing entity for a first session to a first receiving entity, wherein the first session is assigned a session group identifier (ID); wherein the receiver receives a second request from the first sourcing entity for a second session to a second receiving entity, wherein the second request is assigned a second group identifier (ID);*

wherein, in response to the requests to reserve resources, the resource reservation engine determines whether the session group ID of the first session matches the session group ID of the second session for which resources have previously been reserved and, if so, directs the traffic scheduler to share the resources reserved for the one or more second sessions with the first session.

PATENTS  
112025-0483  
CPOL # 124051 Seq.# 4446

The highlighted portions introduce the fact that there are always two (or more) receivers that are arranged to receive a traffic flow (a session) from a sourcing entity. These two receivers attach to the computer network via other network devices (routers, items 114 and 116 in FIG. 1). Within the network there may be myriad other routers transferring the traffic, as known in the art. In the present original invention "clients" is used to signify disparate receivers connected by routers to the Internet. An example of such an arrangement is a conference call where two receivers at different physical locations (e.g. Boston item 114, Detroit item 116) are on the Internet and a third caller is at a third Internet location (California, item 108) and knows the "telephone" numbers of the first two. The third caller requests a session (traffic flow) to the first receiver with some high speed service, say due to video, and then requests a connection to the second with the same high speed requirement. The inventive system in this embodiment would assign common ID's to the two traffic flows and use the same resources to accomplish the common traffic flow of video. This particular scenario illustrates an embodiment of the present invention as now claimed and distinguishes the cited references.

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 75-83 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Primak (US 6,598,077). Column 8, lines 24-27 of Primak were cited as disclosing establishing a first session from a network sourcing device to a first network receiving device, and for the second session to a second network receiving device and reserving resources for the first and second sessions. The Office Action then cited col. 3, lines 2-5 and 15-30.

Relevant portions of claim 75 include:

PATENTS  
112025-0483  
CPOL # 124051 Seq.# 4446

establishing the first session from a *network sourcing device to a first network receiving device routing through an intermediate network device*;  
using the same group session ID for establishing a second session;  
establishing the second session from the *network sourcing device to a second network receiving device routing through the intermediate network device*; and

Column 8, lines 24-47, cited by the Examiner, includes the following relevant portion:

..." the session ID can be a cookie or some other unique code for identifying the client 60 by the application server 30. During the session, all subsequent requests from the client 60 generally include the session ID.

Using FIG. 2 as an example, when a request is received by the web server 20b from the client 60, the plug-in 22b of the web server 20b transmits the request to the dynamic content router 10. The dynamic content router 10 extracts or intercepts the session ID from the request, and stores the session ID and a session server identifier (or session server ID) as a record in the session table 12. The session server ID identifies the application server with the client 60 and issued the session ID.

Each time a request for content is received from the client 60, the dynamic content router 10 examines the header of the request for a session ID. If the request contains a session ID, the dynamic content router 10 compares the session ID against the entries in the session table 12. If the session ID matches a session ID in one of the session records stored in the session table 12, the dynamic content router 10 instructs the plug-in 22b to route the request to the application server associated with the session server ID in the matching session record. However, if no matching session record is found...."

Underline added.

The cited passage, column 3, lines 2-5; 15-30 do not help.

Lines 2-5 state, "...if a session already exists between the client and one of the...the content router routes all request to such application server." Again there is one client only.

Lines 15-30 includes several references to, "... the client..." - this passage only addresses a single "the client."

Please note that there is no mention or suggestion of an advantage of a second

PATENTS  
112025-0483  
CPOL # 124051 Seq.# 4446

receiver (a second client); the above passage is specific to A CLIENT. Please note that FIG. 2 shows a single client 60 connected to the Internet.

In short Primak does not disclose or suggest the limitation in claims 75 -83, and the corresponding limitation in all the claims as amended, in the present application:

establishing the first session from a *network sourcing device to a first network receiving device routing through an intermediate network device*;

using the same group session ID for establishing a second session;

establishing the second session from the *network sourcing device to a second network receiving device routing through the intermediate network device*; and..

On page 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 7-10, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Awadallah (U.S. 6,449,251) in view of Primak (U.S. 6,598,077).

As now amended a relevant portion of claim 1 contains:

a receiver arranged to receive a *first request from a first sourcing entity for a first session to a first receiving entity*, wherein the first session is assigned a session group identifier (ID); wherein the receiver receives a *second request from the first sourcing entity for a second session to a second receiving entity*, wherein the second request is assigned a second group identifier (ID);

PATENTS  
112025-0483  
CPOL # 124051 Seq.# 4446

The Office action cites passages column 3, line 61-column 4, line 11, column 7, lines 7-10, 38-45, 25-33, column 3, lines 2-5, 15-30 and column 8, lines 24-47.

A fair reading of Awadallah is that he is concerned with quality of service to ensure enough bandwidth to accommodate different needs, for example, audio and video. The Office Action at the bottom of page 6 states that Awadallah does not specifically use session group ID's, that, the Action continues, are supplied by Primak.

Please note that Awadallah in his FIG.s only indicates two network devices, say the LAN 212 and WAN 213 of FIG. 2, where different traffic, audio or video, etc. flows occur. As just mentioned Awadallah is concerned with making sure, by prioritizing and queuing, there is enough bandwidth to accommodate the flows. See his TITLE and TECHNICAL FIELD. There is no suggestion, and there is no need or incentive, of sharing resources among a sourcing and two receiving clients, as in present claims as amended. Primak does not help as discussed above for claims 75-83.

The additional cited references, Chiu (U.S. 6,744,767), Lambert (U.S. 6,363,478), do not help. The claims as now amended distinguish these patents as applied to the Primak and Awadallah.

It is respectfully urged that the above demonstrations clearly distinguish Primak and Awadallah with respect to claims 75-83 and claim 1 as now amended. Corresponding demonstrations apply to all the remaining independent claims and from them to all the dependent claims.

PATENTS  
112025-0483  
CPOL # 124051 Seq.# 4446

Respectfully, a notice of allowance is requested for claims 1-83, as now amended,  
in the present application.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account  
No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin H. Paul

Edwin H. Paul  
Reg. No. 31,405  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500